

I look forward to his report, and hope that it will result in affirmative action by the Congress.

Likewise, I believe that we should examine carefully the tax on capital gains, various excises, and tax treatment of different groups and individuals on the basis of special distinctions.

Mr. President, I do not wish to have it thought that because of my advocacy of the four tax proposals which I have just discussed that I have become a victim of the balanced-budget fetish.

I do not believe that there is anything sacrosanct about any item now in the President's budget. Nor do I believe that a program outside the President's arbitrary framework is untouchable. The administration has created a mythical balanced budget which was achieved on paper a year and half before it was possible to actually balance the books—and with heavy reliance on revenue measures not yet law, for example, the motor-fuels tax increase.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that even the present budget, which has been sent to Congress by the White House, for \$77 billion, cannot be regarded as balanced unless Congress increases motor fuel taxes and increases postal rates. Two of the bills which I have introduced today are intended to accomplish that purpose. Therefore, I believe it is wise that Members of the Senate recognize the basic, unassailable fact that we are not talking about a balanced budget of even \$77 billion unless two of the revenue measures which I have introduced here are enacted into law.

The fundamental purpose of the budget is to weigh "opportunity costs," the price of giving up one thing so as to do something deemed of greater importance, the division of resources between the public and the private sectors of the economy, between competing programs within the budgetary framework.

The fact that a particular program has accumulated a hoary tradition of congressional support is no argument in itself for its continued Federal backing. The budgetary procedure is one of review and allocation. It should not be stultified by habit or pressure.

Nor do I wish to leave the impression that concern with the questions of inflation or deficit spending has caused me to lose sight of the problems of full employment and maximum growth which face us today.

EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH GOALS VITAL

In this session, as in the past, I urge enactment of a broader housing program, liberalization of unemployment compensation, passage of a depressed areas bill to relieve those living in sections of chronic unemployment, increase and extension of the minimum wage law. I again support measures to provide Federal assistance to the States in classroom construction, extend Federal help offered airports, authorize construction of water control projects. All of these measures will have a beneficial effect on growth and employment and will tend to increase tax revenues and aid in solving problems of stagnation which have appeared in the "post-recession" economy.

But while I recognize these facts, I am disturbed by the continued reluctance to seek new revenue sources. Increasing concern is being shown as to placement of the public debt. There exists the possibility that debt monetization may increase through the commercial banking system more rapidly than economic growth, thus supplying a potential source of inflation.

Interest and service charges involved in bond financing add to the cost of the program to be implemented. These costs benefit directly only the lenders. Interest payments in fiscal year 1960 are estimated at \$8,096 million. In fiscal year 1955 the figure was \$6,438 million. In 5 years interest costs increased over 20 percent. Today interest payments represent 10.5 percent of total budget expenditures—more than we will spend on all the Federal functions of commerce and housing, natural resources, and labor and welfare.

Mr. President, that proportion of GNP represented by nondefense expenditures by the Federal Government has declined every year since fiscal year 1954 with the exception of 1958 when special stimulatory measures were taken to aid the economy in recovering from the recession. I believe that if we are to effectively provide the goods and services which our country needs, we must consider increasing that share of resources allocated to the public sector through taxation. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "Taxes are what we pay for civilized society."

I share with Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York the view that we should not shove off onto the backs of future generations our own burdens today. They will have plenty of problems of their own. Are we self-sacrificing enough to meet the test of the 20th century? This question is implicit in the revenue-raising measures I have introduced in the Senate this afternoon.

In his thoughtful syndicated column for March 5, Mr. Walter Lippmann has called for higher taxes in order to meet our ever-rising duties in our own land and in the world. This column appeared here in the Washington Post and Times-Herald and in the Oregonian of Portland, Ore. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STULTIFYING DOGMA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's budget is now a football in a political scrimmage. Both parties are pretending that they are struggling to balance the budget. In fact neither the administration nor the Congress shows any sign of being willing to vote the taxes which are absolutely essential if the budget is to be balanced.

As of now, both parties regard as untouchable the income tax rates which were fixed in 1954, the date of the Eisenhower reduction of taxes. The President's budget plan, if we accept some rather fancy calculations, can be brought into balance—but only if Congress will raise postal rates and increase the gasoline taxes. As Congress is certain to reject the new taxes, the official theory of the Democrats seems to be that they can

balance the budget by cutting down on what the President has asked for in foreign aid.

Both parties have now worked themselves into a jam which, considering the state of the world, is not an inspiring thing to look at. The Republicans have gotten themselves into a position where they must save on spending for native American needs—such as education and public facilities, almost certainly also the national defense. But the Republicans, as the great savers, are implored by the President to spend abroad on foreign aid the sums they would like to spend here at home.

The Democrats on the other hand have worked themselves into the embarrassing position where they, the party of Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Stevenson, are threatening to save on foreign aid in order to spend more at home.

Surely, there is something inherently absurd in a situation where the Republicans are the globalists and the Democrats are the isolationists. Could such a topsy-turvy situation have developed if politicians in both parties had not forgotten the realities of our national needs while they play politics with the budget and with taxes?

What has happened to all these earnest and patriotic men? They have become entangled in a dogma which few of the Members of Congress and none of the leaders in Washington have the courage to challenge. What is the dogma? Is it that the budget should be balanced? No. The budget should if possible be balanced, and if that is impossible, there should nevertheless be a serious attempt made to balance it.

The dogma which confuses the whole situation and the position of both parties is that the budget must be balanced without raising the income tax rates. The crux of the matter is the acceptance by both sets of political leaders of the dogma that the income tax rates of 1954 are sacrosanct.

Once that dogma is accepted, the budget cannot be balanced except by two equally unacceptable methods. One is to balance it by taxes on consumption. This is something that Congress will not now do. The other method is to balance the budget at the expense of our national defense and of our foreign policy, and of our internal public needs and development. This is something that the country cannot afford to do.

Here, having accepted the dogma about the 1954 income tax rates, we have locked ourselves in a room from which there is no decent exit.

What is in prospect now, unless there is a revival of national leadership at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, is, first, a budget which does not balance because Congress and the President between them will not produce the taxes necessary to balance it; second, a budget which does not support our national interests at home and abroad, and will, therefore, have to be supplemented in the near future by extraordinary appropriations.

While this is going on we shall have to pay the price of having neglected our national needs because we were too soft and too timid to tax ourselves enough.

STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Monday I introduced for myself and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] a bill (S. 1243) dealing with foreign language proficiency standards and training for the Foreign Service of the United States. The bill also contains provisions designed to facilitate recruitment for the Foreign Service.

The United States has come of age in the past two decades. We have once and for all joined the world. America's detached and distant situation, as Washington called it in his Farewell Address, is gone like yesterday's snows. And gone with it is any possibility of following Washington's advice to steer clear of the foreign world.

Largely because of the recentness of our advent to the position we now occupy in the world, our country is in a comparatively immature stage in preparing its people for life as citizens of a leading international power. By and large American educational processes and family life are still inner directed relative to the rest of the world. There are, however, many developments in education which are turning our people more and more to an "outer directed" orientation vis-a-vis other nations and their people.

Let me mention a few:

In January 1948, Congress passed the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange—Smith-Mundt—Act, Public Law 80-402, which gave the Government permanent authority to engage in worldwide educational and cultural exchanges with the people of other countries. The semiannual reports of the Secretary of State and of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange contain a review of the manifold programs and activities under the act.

Last year marked the 10th year of educational exchanges under the world renowned Fulbright Act, Public Law 79-584.

The program of university contracts abroad for technical assistance, administered by the International Cooperation Administration, has been in operation under the Mutual Security Act since 1951.

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Law 85-864, established a program to further the teaching of modern foreign languages not generally taught in this country and to provide for studies necessary for a full understanding of the areas in which such languages are commonly used.

Several institutions in my State of Massachusetts are leaders in various fields of international studies. Among these are my own alma mater, Harvard University, which has a host of programs and activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels; the University of Massachusetts, which is participating in faculty-exchange programs in Japan and Venezuela under ICA and USIA, respectively; Tufts College and its Fletcher School of Diplomacy; Boston University, which has one of the Nation's leading African area studies programs; Massachusetts Institute of Technology and its Center for International Studies, which has done excellent work under contract to the Foreign Relations Committee; Clark University, a leader in the study of geography; Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Mount Holyoke; Radcliffe, Smith, and Wellesley Colleges with well-established international student-exchange programs; Brandeis University with its Wien international scholarship program, and its Mediterranean, Near Eastern, and

Judaic studies; Amherst College with its Merrill Center for Economics at which international summer seminars on major economic problems are held.

Recently I have been corresponding with Father Vincent R. Dolbec, A.A., dean of the faculty of Assumption College, about its newly proposed summer institutes in Russian and French languages and culture. The school has a proud reputation for its foreign-studies effort.

Only a few days ago I conferred with Dr. Glenn A. Olds, president of Springfield College, and heard something of the promising new projects which he is planning there.

Plainly, more and more is being done in America in the development of programs of international education, research, and study, whose long-run effect will be felt throughout the fabric of our society in giving all our citizens an orientation consistent with the role in the world which our Nation must play. Similar influences stem from the continually expanding oversea operations of American business enterprises and the steadily increasing activities of our many nongovernmental, informal educational organizations.

However, we would be deluding ourselves if we failed to recognize that there is room for much more to be done. We are indeed fortunate that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], recognizes this. The bill (S-1205) which he filed on February 26, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide advanced training in foreign countries during summer vacation for teachers of foreign languages, is an imaginative and constructive proposal which deserves prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

The educational activities which are going on and which are being planned in America are but a small proportion of all that will have to be done before the vast majority of our citizens will be globally oriented; before our young people will come to regard an oversea career with the same interest and alacrity as they now view domestic careers. I commend to all Senators for study the hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee held February 18 at which Dean Harlan Cleveland, dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, and two of his associates discussed in most stimulating fashion the subject of the oversea Americans.

During the course of the hearing, Dean Cleveland made the following observations in talking about the urgency of changing the attitudes of our citizens to make them more compatible with the role of our Nation in the world:

I am also painfully aware as an educator that there is a certain cycle in growing people, as there is in other forms of agriculture, and that if we have an outstanding personnel, oversea personnel service, including the Foreign Service and other forms of oversea civilian service in a generation, we will have to operate with the greatest urgency today in growing the kinds of people that will have to make up that service.

So the first thing is to put it on a long-range basis, and the second thing is to establish enough training and education programs around the country to begin to produce a real pool of qualified people.

I think there is much wisdom in these observations by Dean Cleveland. Perhaps their principal significance is their implication for the Foreign Service of the United States and our other governmental oversea operations, for they must recruit their personnel from the ranks of young men and women with the outlooks and qualifications which today's American education and family life impart to them. Until time and hard work have wrought the transformation in outlook and qualification of our citizens so as to create a real pool of first-rate oversea emissaries, it seems inevitable that there will have to be considerable orientation and language training of Americans who are to serve in our Government's oversea operations.

The principal center for such training within the Government is the Foreign Service Institute, which is doing a fine job in its crucial work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two interesting, recent magazine articles about the Foreign Service Institute.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, February 1959]

OUR OVERSEAS TASK FORCE IN MUFTI

(By John Stuart Martin)

In a Japanese port, a brisk, Michigan-bred woman strides into a police station near the waterfront. She exchanges greetings with her good friend, the desk sergeant, and listens to what is troubling him this evening: Some American seamen have wrecked a tavern and have been locked up. Riding herd on such cases has long been one of this lady's specialties as a U.S. consul charged with matters maritime.

In New Delhi, India, a U.S. attaché who can read and speak Hindi pores over stacks of Blitz, a virulently anti-American journal. His task: To find out the editor's grievances and then try to clear up his misconceptions.

Somewhere in southeast Asia, a U.S. consular official broadcasts a radio warning: "Attention, all American citizens. Attention. Call the U.S. consulate at once." With Red guerrillas approaching his area, he is preparing an emergency evacuation of American residents.

In the Foreign Service of the United States are about 4,500 such people, counting those on duty in State Department offices at home. Serving about 12 years abroad to 3 stateside, they staff 278 Foreign Service posts in 87 foreign lands.

Their duties are of two basic kinds: Diplomatic—maintaining friendly relations with foreign governments; and consular—protecting American lives, rights, trade, and property throughout the world. Ranging in rank from ambassador down through minister to first, second, and third secretary, and from consul general to consul and vice consul, they are the unarmed custodians of our national honor and interest wherever our flag flies on a guest basis.

The instruments they use are mainly psychological and economic, ranging from money grants to cultural exchanges, from information and propaganda to farm aid. The job involves everything from making arrangements for Danny Kaye or Marian Anderson on a good-will tour to explaining

Little Rock, juvenile delinquency, or Hollywood absurdities.

Recently I went to Washington to learn what kinds of people are now entering our Foreign Service, and how the corps is being trained for its crucial work. I was aware of the criticism that has been directed at our overseas representatives: That they are drawn from the most privileged groups, that their training prepares them to deal more with social amenities than with the realities of the cold war.

I found that in the last few years the entire concept of foreign service has been revitalized, thanks to the potent stimulus of the Wriston report of 1954, the personnel-policy study headed by Henry M. Wriston, then president of Brown University. Except at the very top, where the President still enjoys latitude in choosing Secretaries of State and Ambassadors as his personal representatives, entry into the Foreign Service is no longer possible through influence or affluence. From the bottom up the corps is entirely career, wide open, and highly competitive.

More than 4,000 candidates annually take the tough entrance exams at 65 educational centers throughout the country. Only about 150 are selected. No college degree is required, but usually some 65 percent of the winners have not only B.A.'s but M.A.'s, and 5 percent have Ph. D.'s. Average age is 26. Men outnumber women 15 to 1, but able women are prized.

Those selected through the written exams are screened orally for an exacting combination of traits: leadership, mental and moral fiber, special flair for languages, skill in political analysis. The men and women finally chosen are a remarkable cross section of the country's young talent, and could almost certainly climb fast in other professions. In the Foreign Service their pay begins at about \$100 per week, and they know that 12 or 15 years must pass before that figure is doubled. The knowledge of their eliteness, plus the realization that they are performing a vital service, must be a large share of their reward.

To the Foreign Service Institute, founded in 1946, is entrusted the job of turning these new recruits into accomplished diplomats. Operating today with a budget commensurate with its importance in our national life, the Institute has become a highly professional college, where making friends and influencing people on a world scale is approached as a fine art.

Now housed in new quarters a couple of miles up the Potomac from the Pentagon, the Foreign Service Institute is headed by Harold Boies Hoskins, 63, a sharp-witted former textile executive with years of foreign-trade experience. To its old basic-training course for new Foreign Service officers there has been added a refresher course for promising midcareer people. Atop that, there is now a course for seniors who are eligible and needed to fill the highest Foreign Service posts.

The basic course for Foreign Service recruits lasts 12 weeks. It teaches the Service's history and its place among other Government agencies. Packed in tightly are lectures and seminars on large subjects like "Answering Criticisms of the United States Abroad," "Philosophy of World Labor Groups," Middle East problems, Communist strategy, international law. For the most part, however, the instruction deals with rules and tools: how Foreign Service posts operate, how to promote American trade, how to handle routine consular duties such as visas, admission of aliens, intelligence work. There are also field trips to such government agencies as an immigration center, an Atomic Energy Commission laboratory and the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md.

Perhaps one or two expert linguists in a class of 25 will go abroad immediately; the rest will stay in Washington for a year or 18 months, working at desk jobs in the State Department and continuing their language studies. For it has finally dawned on Washington that Americans are woefully clumsy with the most potent peace tool of all: the ability to speak other peoples' languages. There is now a crash program in language learning throughout the Foreign Service. Besides its Washington classes, the Institute runs language-study centers in Mexico City, Paris, Frankfurt, Beirut, Tokyo and Taichung (on Taiwan). Using texts and tapes from home and tutors hired locally, it gives extension courses to some 2,700 U.S. employees at 158 overseas posts.

On the Institute faculty there are nearly 200 instructors, half of whom are foreign-born tutors in 22 languages. The school's corridors buzz at coffee breaks with conversations in Burmese, Cambodian, Persian, and other exotic tongues. The course is probably the world's most intensive. The method used is "overlearning"—constant reiteration to achieve speech that is instinctively correct. Hour after hour, in groups of six or less, the trainees sit in cubicles with phonetic lesson sheets before them and learn, by repeating phrases after the tutor, to coordinate tongue, ear and brain in foreign patterns. They also practice "kinesics," the motions and gestures of head, hands and body proper to the language they are learning.

In off hours the trainees have at their disposal an audio-tape practice room, nicknamed "Babel," containing three dozen booths, each with a two-track tape recorder. Turning on his machine, the student hears a tutor speak. He echoes the words into his mike, then plays back both voices. Spotting his own mistakes, he can erase his track, then try over and over again. In the tape library are rolls containing courses in 43 languages.

Wives are considered so important that, before posting abroad, they are invited to the Institute for coaching in foreign amenities—dress, deportment, handling of servants. In charge of this program is Mrs. M. Williams Blake, a Foreign Service widow with experience in nine countries.

For the Institute's mid-career course, promising officers of 10 or 12 years' service are picked, in groups of about 20, to become higher-powered administrators, analysts, negotiators. Each group is first sequestered for a fortnight on an old Army post at Front Royal, Va., where they study typical problems a mission might face. Example: What aspects of U.S. life should an American contribution to an international trade fair stress?

Back in Washington, the group plunges into sociology. Professor Marion J. Levy of Princeton, for one, expounds to them such subjects as the contrasting effects of Westernization on the old cultures and politics of China and Japan, and what lessons the contrast teaches about the modernization of underdeveloped countries today.

Then, to learn the inside facts about our national policies and our present strength, the midcareerists are briefed by top Government brass.

Gordon Gray, special assistant to the President for national security affairs, explains the workings of our highest, most secret policy body—the National Security Council. The Chiefs of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research and of the Central Intelligence Agency set forth their techniques for studying our country's friends and foes. George Allen, boss of the United States Information Agency, lectures on good propaganda and bad. ("I don't like that phrase, 'selling ourselves.' One hard fact is worth a gallon of hogwash.")

A Congressman reports congressional temperatures on foreign policy, and what determines them. Leading publicists interpret present-day U.S. culture and attitudes, which often startle Foreign Service officers after years abroad. The midcareerists may also hear authoritatively from industry, labor, the pulpit and universities.

The Institute's senior course, new last September, enrolls only a dozen Foreign Service officers of the three top ranks (average age, 43), plus maybe a half dozen seniors from other services, including the military. Among them are officers already serving or ready to serve as ambassador, minister, consul general. Much of their 10-month course is devoted to advanced studies of foreign policy, and to preparing analytical reports on trips to U.S. labor and trade congresses, scientific conclaves, meetings of bar and medical associations, which bring them up to date on the climate of American society.

"If we are to insure our future," Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, said recently, "our Foreign Service officers would appear to be our most promising overseas task force."

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Jan. 3, 1959]

SCHOOL FOR MODERN DIPLOMATS

(By Henry F. and Katharine Pringle)

Not very long ago, the typical young man who chose the United States Foreign Service as a career was a socialite, a graduate from an eastern seaboard college, had a private income and took pleasure in wearing striped pants. He limited his official and social contacts mainly to other diplomats. He spoke cultivated English and perhaps halting French or German. The mere notion of learning Arabic, Chinese, or Malayan would have filled him with well-bred distaste. Foreigners should, of course, speak English.

Happily, much of this has changed. Important in the evolution of our new, more practical style in diplomats is a unique school, the Foreign Service Institute, operated by the State Department in Arlington, Va., where successful candidates for the Foreign Service come for training. The backgrounds of the students are varied. They come from every State in the Union, plus Hawaii. They are graduates of many different colleges, some quite small and obscure. Many are ex-servicemen; some have had experience as businessmen, newspaper reporters, teachers, lawyers, and engineers. Ten percent of them are girls—a fact which would have caused yesterday's diplomat to choke on the olive in his martini. Before going abroad, all of them will, through an intensive new method, learn to speak at least one foreign language.

The primary purpose of the Foreign Service Institute is to prepare the people who represent the United States in foreign lands to do the best possible job. This requires a broad curriculum which is offered to an average enrollment of about 3,000 a year, including 1,000 full-time and 2,000 part-time students. The full-time students include recently appointed Foreign Service officers who are undergoing 3 months of basic training, followed by another 4 months of special language training if they need it. Usually there is a handful of senior officers, even an occasional ambassador, taking specialized training. In addition, the FSI is open to personnel of a number of Government agencies concerned with foreign affairs, such as the U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration. Also among the students, all voluntarily, are the wives of junior Foreign Service officers who want to learn something about the culture and customs of the strange posts for which they are soon to depart—places such as Addis Ababa, Saigon, Kabul, or Taihoku. All students, except the

wives, of course, draw full pay while they are going to school.

The novice diplomats are instructed in everything from consular procedures to the most effective ways of answering foreigners' criticism of the United States. To the wives are unfolded the mysteries of diplomatic protocol. Informal meetings, limited to the ladies, are arranged with experienced wives who have served from Oslo to Cape Town. No questions are barred. At one such session was a bright-eyed girl with a blond pony tail. Not yet a wife, but a very earnest fiance, she was to be married to a junior officer just before he set out on his first assignment.

"Looking ahead," she said, practically, if prematurely, "will I be expected to go to official functions when I'm pregnant?"

When the older wives stopped laughing, they told her that the answer depended somewhat on the post. She would certainly be welcome in most places, particularly in Latin America, where motherhood is warmly approved. On the other hand, the tribal taboos of a few African chiefs forbid receiving women in an expectant condition.

Commonsense hints to the wives are given under the direction of Regina Olszewski Blake, widow of a Foreign Service officer, who, during the 16 years of her marriage, accompanied her husband to Warsaw, Basel, Tampico, Teheran, Rome and Dakar. A warmhearted, friendly and reassuring woman, she warns the youthful wives that their jobs abroad sometimes will be more difficult than those of their husbands, who will spend most of their working hours in the relatively American atmosphere of their offices. The wife is on her own in an alien land. She must manage the house, take care of the children, direct servants who often pretend to know more English than they really do, buy unfamiliar foods in crowded native markets and handle mechanical breakdowns. Pointing up the need for resourcefulness, she tells the story of the wife at a remote post who chewed vast quantities of gum in order to make plugs for leaks in the plumbing.

Because the thirty to forty wives in any one class may be going to thirty or forty different posts out of the total of 278 the United States maintains around the world the general lectures cannot take up specific problems peculiar to one area. But Mrs. Blake keeps in her office a Post Guidance file which all wives are urged to consult. Here is detailed information, supplied by experienced Foreign Service wives on such things as food problems and social customs in all parts of the world. And the new officers' wives are given personal briefings on practical problems in their future posts. If possible, Mrs. Blake arranges for a student who is going to, say, Afghanistan, to talk with a wife who has been there. In such a case the young wife may learn that she and her husband cannot expect to have Western-style contacts with Afghan couples because the women there are kept in strict purdah—seclusion. Questions about housekeeping get answered in these interviews. How long will a sheet last when washed on the rocks in Djakarta? About as long as when subjected to a Washington laundry, it appears. Is the water safe to drink in Teheran? Not unless it is from the Embassy's private water supply, as the city water system consists of open jubes, or ditches, which also are used for washing clothes, bathing, and rinsing dishes.

The wives' course is not limited to protocol and household hints. Along with secretaries, clerks, and men from other Government agencies assigned abroad, they may take a 2-week orientation course in the fundamentals of American overseas missions. Mrs. Florence Finne, a slim, composed, and pretty Foreign Service officer, presides over these sessions, bringing in speakers from State and other departments to discuss their spe-

cialties. They explain the organization of Embassies and consulates. They outline Communist strategy and tactics. They take students through a quick survey of the American scene in politics, labor, art, agriculture, music, and architecture to make sure that representatives of the United States abroad will be able to talk intelligently about their homeland.

The Foreign Service Institute is tackling the serious challenge of language by spending 60 percent of its \$5 million budget for the teaching of foreign tongues. The system is called intensive or sometimes the Army method. During World War II it was found useful for teaching Japanese and Pacific-area languages, which had been considered extremely difficult to learn. The FSI language classes are tough.

At first, they purposely avoid teaching rules of grammar, and rely on long hours of drill until the new vocabulary and idiom are so well learned that the pupil thinks in the language.

Under the new system an astonishing number of Foreign Service officers are mastering not only Spanish, French, and German but also such tongues as Russian, Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Finnish, Greek, Turkish, Arabic, Hindustani, Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Burmese, and Korean. A few students simply cannot adjust their vocal cords or curl their tongues in the right way. Once in a while a student, unable to stand the intensive drill, collapses into hysterics and quits. But such failures are rare.

This new emphasis on learning at least one foreign language well reflects a change in U.S. conception of diplomacy since World War II. The old idea was that our representative abroad was a delegate from our Government to the foreign government. The modern conception is that he is also our representative to the people of the host nation. It is no longer good enough for the Foreign Service officer to associate mainly with a few members of the foreign ministry. He has a basic obligation to know the people—something best achieved by talking with them in their own language.

In November 1956, Secretary of State Dulles approved a new language policy for the Foreign Service under which all officers would be expected to acquire a useful knowledge of at least one foreign language within 5 years or within the same period after appointment, and preferably fluency in a second language as well. Junior officers would not be promoted until they had met the requirement. Exceptions would sometimes be made for senior officers or others whose post did not provide opportunities for language learning. It would hardly have been feasible to force the minority of political ambassadors to become fluent before taking up their duties. But our Ambassador to Brazil, Ellis O. Briggs, a career officer who already knew Spanish, volunteered to take 3 months of intensive training in Portuguese at the FSI. So did Mrs. Briggs.

This past year the FSI had classes going full time in 27 different tongues. In charge of this rather staggering program is Howard E. Sollenberger, dean of the School of Languages. He has been bilingual from childhood, having been raised in North China by missionary parents. Before joining the FSI, Sollenberger taught Chinese to workers of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and prepared them for service in the Far East.

Sollenberger has a staff of about 100 tutors or native speakers, some of them part time, and 20 full-time linguistic scientists—many of whom oversee classes in more than one language. The linguistic scientists worry the students as little as possible with textbook rules. People communicate by talking far more than by writing; besides, the way a language is written is often no key to the way it is spoken.

The new policy already is beginning to pay dividends. Take the case of a youthful consul, Robert E. Barbour, assigned to Vietnam. Before going to his post he was sent to Georgetown University, in Washington, for his preliminary work in Vietnamese, and then went through several months' grind at the FSI. When he reported to Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow in Vietnam, he was instructed to spend his first 3 months in further concentration on the language. By the time the new American consulate opened at Hué, a seaport north of Saigon, the young man had made the acquaintance of all the provincial chiefs and other officials in his area. He invited 180 of them to the opening ceremonies, where he translated the Ambassador's remarks and those of the Vietnamese representative. Durbrow reported to the State Department that the Vietnamese were deeply gratified by the new consul's fluency in their own language.

Reading and writing are not ignored in the FSI's language classes. The importance of being able to read the language of the host country was demonstrated not long ago in Indonesia. Until an officer who could read the native papers in the original language was sent to Djakarta, the State Department had 'not been fully aware of their anti-American tone. The Embassy's Indonesian employees had been clipping and translating only the news and editorial items which, they thought, would please their American bosses.

All this reflects the postwar American anxiety to make friends and influence people abroad. The same spirit pervades the whole FSI curriculum. An anthropologist, D. Scott Gilbert, is on hand to impress on students the importance of understanding and respecting the cultures and customs of other peoples. Gilbert shares with other institute lecturers a tendency to toss off high-flown anthropological terms, to caution against "ethnocentrism" and "culture shock." But the talks boil down to a very sensible warning not to go abroad with the set conviction that the American way of life is superior in all ways to all others.

Another name for the FSI might be School for Dos and Don'ts in the Foreign Service. These classifications are hammered into the young men and women from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., with case histories to underline the point. There was, for instance, the brash junior officer who had been assigned to visa work in Manila. An attractive young Filipino girl came to the consulate to have her passport validated. The vice consul looked at her pretty face and legs and made a wisecrack.

"I suppose you're going to the United States to snag yourself a rich husband?"

The girl's father happened to be a prominent official of the islands. She reported the vice consul's impertinence to papa, and within a couple of weeks the offending young man was on his way home, his Foreign Service career at an end.

Advice on how to make use of the customs of the country is given by experts such as William Barnes, former chief of the State Department's foreign-reporting staff. One morning last year Barnes concluded a solemn discussion of the problems of obtaining and analyzing economic data abroad with a story of his own experience in Finland. One of the best ways to collect economic information there, he had discovered, was to attend a sauna, or steam-bath party, with a group of Finnish bankers and industrialists. A sauna involves being parboiled, naked, at high temperature in a steam room, after which the participants plunge into the frigid waters of an adjoining lake. Thus stimulated, and still naked, the guests relax on a porch with their host and sip drinks. At this stage, said Barnes, they are likely to talk very frankly about their problems.

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2989

"Under the circumstances," he observed, "it is hard for them to play their cards close to their chests."

How and how not to use an interpreter is the subject of a hilarious FSI skit which acknowledges a debt to "The Teahouse of the August Moon." Performed regularly for each new group of junior officers, the purpose of the playlet is to dramatize the mistakes that an inexperienced Foreign Service officer might make.

The scene is a seaport town on Okinawa. In a performance last fall, Richard Noss, of the language staff, played the role of a newly arrived American vice consul calling on the mayor. Two of the Institute's tutors, Kiyanao Okami and Teruki Komatsu, represented the mayor and the vice consul's interpreter. The three scholars showed surprising histrionic talent. The vice consul was brusque and in a hurry. He told the interpreter to tell the mayor he had only fifteen minutes.

"Express to the mayor some noble sentiments and all that," he said. "Keep it brief. Tell him three United States Senators are arriving next week and I'm in charge of the reception."

An interminable conversation in Japanese, the language used in Okinawa, ensued between Messrs. Okami and Komatsu, with much bowing and scraping, followed by this dialogue in English:

"VICE CONSUL. What was that all about?"

"INTERPRETER. He talk and talk a long time.

"VICE CONSUL. I could see that. What did he say? Keep it short.

"INTERPRETER. Mayor expressed appreciation of kind sentiments. Said he wished to discuss important matter—American airbase expansion which robbing the farmers of their land.

"VICE CONSUL. Oh, tell him all I want is to have him go to the airport to meet the Senators, to take some important people with him. Nanki-Poo! Funny costumes! All that kind of stuff."

Okami and Komatsu engaged in another long exchange in Japanese. The interpreter then explained that the mayor was inviting the American official to his house for tea, to which the vice consul replied that he hated tea, "but I'll take a rain check."

"Rain check?" asked the puzzled interpreter. This involved the vice consul in a long explanation of the rules applying to American baseball tickets.

After the playlet ended, amid laughter, Noss summed up its lessons. The misunderstandings were not merely funny, he warned. They might have been disastrous. The consular officer should have addressed his remarks directly to the mayor, and not to the interpreter. He should have assumed that the Okinawan official understood some English, as he probably did. The vice consul should not have used American colloquialisms. And obviously he should not have ignored the expected formalities, nor rudely brushed aside the subjects which the mayor wished to raise.

The Foreign Service Institute is without doubt a livelier and more effective teaching agency today than it was a few years ago. The school was established in March 1947. With the greatest expansion of the Service after World War II, it was essential to train large numbers of new officers to get along with foreign peoples and to report their activities accurately. But within the next few years the morale of the State Department and of the Foreign Service slumped, due largely to the claim of the late Joseph R. McCarthy that Communists had infiltrated. The Institute became something of a stepchild, badly housed on C Street at a short distance from the State Department.

In March 1954, the Secretary of State appointed a distinguished committee, of which Henry M. Wriston, then president of

Brown University, was chairman, to appraise the Department's personnel policies. Its report was highly critical. The Foreign Service officer corps, it found, numbered only 1,285, the lowest strength in 5 years. Only 355 officers had been appointed to the beginning-officer classification in the past 8 years. One remedy proposed by the committee was that Foreign Service officers should be recruited from all parts of the country, bringing the Service closer to a democratic ideal.

Today there is no shortage of candidates. Last year nearly 340 new junior officers were selected from among 6,500 hopefuls who took the examinations. Many are attracted by the lure of strange places, by an aura of glamour which still clings to the Foreign Service. They can be sure of fairly complete security and of salaries ranging from \$4,730 at the bottom to a top of \$20,000, plus some expense allowances.

In its criticisms of the Foreign Service, the Wriston report described the Foreign Service Institute as having fallen into the "intellectual doldrums." It had not measured up to the standards envisioned by Congress, which had hoped for an institution comparable to the Naval and Army War Colleges.

In March 1955 Harold B. Hoskins was made Director of the FSI, and the Institute began a rapid emergence from obscurity. Hoskins, in his early sixties, is not an educator, but a businessman of wide experience. Born in Beirut, the son of missionaries, Hoskins' hobby for years has been the role of the United States in foreign affairs. He has often served the State Department as a consultant on Middle Eastern economic problems and gone on missions to Arab nations. His ability as a salesman, acquired during his industrial career, has been of great value in explaining the FSI's budget to congressional committees.

Congress has been fairly generous. Among other things, the FSI no longer need apologize for its quarters, which are efficient, if not luxurious. Since the spring of 1957 the classrooms, offices, and auditorium have been housed in what used to be the lower-floor garage of Arlington Towers, one of the plush apartment developments on the outskirts of Washington. The space has been divided into two floors, and has a functional all-glass front that extends for about a block along one wing of the building. This setting gives more of a government than a campus atmosphere to the school.

The prestige of the Foreign Service Institute, which was quite low for a time in the eyes of State Department brass, gained ground in the last 3 years. Last September even Secretary Dulles took an hour out of his whirlwind schedule to inaugurate the first senior-officer course, the State Department's equivalent of the Defense War College.

Hoskins and his assistants are constantly pondering what should be added, subtracted or modified to keep the FSI in tune with needs of the Foreign Service. They are now concerned that the courses for midcareer officers may not be stimulating enough independent thinking. They are worried about the area specialization courses, although the very fact that the Foreign Service now has some 400 specialists trained in Near and Far Eastern and Iron Curtain country languages and problems is encouraging. Should there be more economics taught at the FSI? More on international-labor movements?

Most impartial observers of the FSI would probably agree that its intensive language training and its advice for living and working with other peoples are its major contributions to diplomacy in today's troubled world. The down-to-earth tutoring goes much deeper than protocol or the right clothes for Rangoon. The young officers, their wives and clerical personnel are all urged to keep up their hobbies abroad or develop some, for many doors to friendships will thereby be

opened. They are told about the consul who was assigned to Lourenço Marques, the capital of Portuguese Mozambique. He was an avid amateur ornithologist and was delighted to find that few places in the world had so great a variety of strange birds as this outpost. He made contacts with the local ornithologists and won their gratitude by giving his leisure time to helping out at the natural-history museum. Then there was the diplomat's wife who was a ham radio operator. When an earthquake tumbled buildings in Quito, Ecuador, and disrupted communications, she was able to send out messages and assist rescue expeditions. She was decorated by the Ecuadoran Government for her services.

The young people who will leave shortly for their first foreign posts are warned against yearning for London, Paris or one of the other great capitals. The work at a smaller embassy may be much more rewarding and important. They are also cautioned against being disappointed if they are assigned to consular work, as 60 percent of them are sure to be. The consul's job may not seem dashing, but it deals closely with people.

"We've got an American dying here. What shall we do?" is one of the more troublesome inquiries a consul may have from a hotel or boardinghouse. In a case some years ago a lazy but imaginative consul in Indochina solved his problem by persuading an American at death's door to take out French citizenship, "to avoid being a damned nuisance to me when you pop off." That sort of thing is frowned on these days. The consul is supposed to see that a fellow citizen felled by illness has proper medical attention and, if the worst happens, to locate the deceased's relatives, perhaps arrange a funeral, or to settle his estate. One consul found himself handling the sale of a large herd of cattle.

Live Americans abroad, however, are even more of a problem than dead ones—at least to a consul. They may demand anything on earth, including funds to go home. The Foreign Service is trained to help as much as it can, but there are limits. That is why one of the most respected rules taught its students by the FSI is: "Never lend your own money."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Foreign Service Institute offers what is perhaps the best intensive training in more foreign languages than is available in any other educational institution in the United States.

The purpose of the bill (S. 1243) which I have introduced with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is in part to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for our Foreign Service and to assure utmost use of the Institute's facilities in achieving and maintaining such standards.

While it is important to recognize that foreign language proficiency will not in and of itself assure high-caliber performance of oversea service, it is hard to conceive of such service being effectively rendered by Americans who are blind, mute and deaf to the language of people of the countries where they serve.

Secretary of State Dulles wrote as follows in the 19th semiannual report to Congress on the international education exchange program:

True communication among people of different cultures is greatly enhanced by the ability to speak and to read each others' language.

Surely no one can disagree with this statement.

In this connection, I am reminded of a statement by the great German poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who wrote:

A man who is ignorant of foreign languages is ignorant of his own.

Goethe's statement, probably made with only semantics in mind, has special subtlety and wisdom as applied to the task of communication in our overseas representation. The same is true of a statement by Samuel Johnson, which all of us who travel from Washington by train have seen many times over the entrance to Union Station.

He that would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him. So it is in traveling: a man must carry knowledge with him if he would bring home knowledge.

The application of these statements to our people who go abroad is dramatically illustrated in the much-publicized book "The Ugly American." This book has done much to focus public attention on the deficiencies in the international orientation of our people and the handicaps which these deficiencies impose on our overseas operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some excerpts which I have made from the last chapter of "The Ugly American."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpts from ch. 22, "A Factual Epilog," of "The Ugly American," by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick]

It would seem a simple fact of life that Ambassadors to at least the major nations should speak those languages. Yet in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, and Turkey, our Ambassadors cannot speak the native tongue (although our Ambassador to Paris can speak German and our Ambassador to Berlin can speak French). In the whole of the Arabic world—nine nations—only two Ambassadors have language qualifications. In Japan, Korea, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, and elsewhere, our Ambassadors must speak and be spoken to through interpreters. In the entire Communist world, only our Ambassador to Moscow can speak the native language.

If Ambassadors were mere figureheads surrounded by experienced, linguistically trained career diplomats, their inability to speak or read on the job would be little more than an insulting inconvenience to the local officials. * * * Unfortunately, Ambassadors are more than figureheads; they are in charge, and, like Sears, their misunderstandings can have grave consequences. Moreover, the career men on their staffs are generally not linguistically trained for their jobs. * * *

In his masterful analysis of the Foreign Service, John Osborne states that the most important element in a good Foreign Service officer is the faculty of communication. Yet, as James Reston reported in the New York Times of March 18, 1958, "50 percent of the entire Foreign Service officer corps do not have a speaking knowledge of any foreign language. Seventy percent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service are in the same state." These figures represent those who can speak no language other than their own—not even French, Spanish, German, or Italian. The number of Americans in the Foreign Service who can speak any of the more difficult languages is miniscule.

In addition to our Foreign Service staffs, we have more than a million servicemen

overseas. Only a handful can speak the language of the country in which they are stationed, and when difficult military and scientific data are involved this handful shrinks to almost zero. So be it, but that our trained representatives in Asia are little better qualified in languages is unacceptable. On the other hand, an estimated 9 out of 10 Russians speak, read, and write the language before the arrive on station. It is a prior requirement. The entire functioning staff of Russian Embassies in Asia is Russian, and all the Russians—the officials, stenographic help, telephone operators, chauffeurs, servants—speak and write the language of the host country.

In the American Embassies the servants, the messengers, and the interpreters are locally hired. The telephone operator in almost every American mission and agency in Asia is an Asian. It is, of course, a maxim of espionage that one of the most useful agents is the planted employee. * * *

Because we must rely on interpreters who are almost always non-Americans, our on-the-spot information is both secondhand and subject to minor censorship and editing without our knowledge. The recent turmoil in Indonesia emphasized this handicap. We had to rely on native translators to interpret the press, the radio, and personal conversation. Following Asian etiquette, by which one avoids telling one's employer of matters which would distress him, the interpreters gave our diplomats rose-tinted reports of local sentiment and events. Only after a dangerous delay did it seep through to our soundproofed representatives that Indonesia was in the grip of political upheaval. In Indochina our military and diplomatic missions could speak only to the French, whose view of the rebellion against them was one-sided, to say the least. One of the authors seeking to hear the Vietnamese side of the question without using either a French or Vietnamese interpreter succeeded only through an American priest, who, like the Father Finian of our book, was fluent in the native tongue. Like the Russians, but unlike ourselves, the church realizes that its work in Asia cannot be done without close communication with Asians.

Blockage of information itself is not the only penalty we pay. Think, for a moment, what it costs us whenever an official American representative demands that the native speak English or be not heard. The Russians make no such mistake. The sign on the Russian Embassy in Ceylon, for example, identifies it in Sinhalese, Tamil, English, and Russian. The American Embassy is identified only in English.

John Foster Dulles stated what was in our minds when we wrote the stories of Colonel Hillandale, the Ragtime Kid, and John Colvin, on the one hand, and of Sears and Swift and Joe Bing, on the other. He said, "Interpreters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language, and without understanding their language it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

Americans like Swift, who cannot speak the language, can have no more than an academic understanding of a country's customs, beliefs, religion, and humor. Restricted to communication with only that special, small, and usually well-to-do segment of the native population fluent in English, they receive a limited and often misleading picture of the nation about them. A recent American ambassador to Ceylon—an able, extremely popular diplomat—had an experience which pointed up this dilemma. He had become intimate with the leaders of the political party in power, a group relict of colonial days composed largely of the rich and English-educated upper class. The ambassador apparently got all his information

from them, because he gave no warning to our State Department before the nationalistic political upheaval occurred which suddenly left his friends with but 8 of 101 seats in the government.

On the other side of the ledger, we have told the story of the ugly engineer and Colonel Hillandale who, speaking the language, were able to go off into the countryside and show the idea of America to the people. These characters are based on actual Americans known to the authors. There are others like them; but by and large they are not beloved of the American officials in the various Asian capitals, and are a wild exception to the rule.

While a few Hillandales and the many Russians roam the barrios and the boondocks, most Americans are restricted, both by official tethers and by language barriers, to communion with each other. * * *

Vice President Nixon, in his National Press Club speech on his tour of Latin America, said, "I could have concentrated on a whole round of cocktail parties and white-tie dinners. If we continue to concentrate on that area we can figure we will lose the battle." What our diplomats need to do, he said, is to get out and mingle with students, labor leaders, and opinion makers, who comprise the "wave of the future."

In the stories of Major Wolchek and Major Monet, "The Iron of War" and "The Lesson of War," we have tried in fiction to describe a condition of avoidable ignorance. For years both we and our allies have put in much expensive effort trying to ferret out in advance the Communist plan for both tactical maneuvers and great conquests. Yet, during the struggle in Indochina the authors could find no American (or French) military or civilian official who had read, or even studied a précis of, the overall Communist operation plan contained in "The Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung," published by Lawrence Wishart, Ltd., London, and International Publishers in the United States. A four-volume edition was published in 1954 but the basic material was available in print as early as 1934. (A useful shorter study is "The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics," by Philip Selznick, McGraw-Hill, 1952.)

In his remarkable work Mao, one of the brilliant tacticians of our time, analyzes almost every campaign and battle in which his Red Armies fought. He dissects every defeat (very few) and most victories, and he explains what they taught him. In doing so he lays down a pattern of strategy and tactics which the Communists of southeast Asia have followed undeviatingly.

The battles which led to Dien Bien Phu were classic examples of the Mao pattern. And yet our military missions advised, and the French went down to defeat, without having studied Mao's writings.

Why our representatives abroad have not learned the languages they need or studied basic sources of information such as Mao's writings is a question which involves the entire American Nation. Whatever the reasons, our overseas services attract far too few of our brightest and best qualified college graduates. * * *

We do not need the horde of 1,500 Americans—mostly amateurs—who are now working for the United States overseas. What we need is a small force of well-trained, well-chosen, hard-working, and dedicated professionals. They must be willing to risk their comforts and, in some lands, their health. They must go equipped to apply a positive policy promulgated by a clear-thinking Government. They must speak the language of the land of their assignment, and they must

... more expert in its problems than are the natives.

Actually, the state in which we find ourselves is far from hopeless. We have the material and, above all, the human resources to change our methods and to win. It is not the fault of the Government or its leaders or any political party that we have acted as we have. It is the temper of the whole Nation. If knowledge of the problem becomes widespread, and if the enthusiasm of the people can be aroused, then we can succeed. As Cordell Hull once said, "The Government of the United States is never far ahead of the American public; nor is it very far behind."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill which I have filed with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would insert in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 a statement of policy to govern the appointment of chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers which could profitably be adopted by all Americans who go overseas. In a very real sense, any of us who goes abroad is representing the United States, regardless of our purpose. Whether such representation of our country will serve her well or ill will largely depend on the extent to which we apply to ourselves the policy which the bill would prescribe for the appointment of chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers.

Mr. President, the policy declaration contained in section 1 of my bill reads as follows:

It is the policy of the Congress that chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers appointed to serve the United States in foreign countries shall have, to the maximum practicable extent, among their qualifications a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which they are to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic, and political institutions, and the interests of such country and its people.

The responsible officials of the Department of State have unquestionably, in my judgment, been working hard at the task of improving the foreign language proficiency of our Foreign Service officers. Because of the limited funds for salaries and administrative and training expenses which the Congress appropriates to the State Department, the rate of progress possible in this vital aspect of training leaves much to be desired. Section 2 of my bill would add to the Foreign Service Act a new section to establish the framework within which a more vigorous program of foreign language training could be established, assuming that the Congress appropriates the funds necessary for its full implementation.

Sections 3 and 4 of the bill would make significant additions to the authority of the Secretary of State in order further to facilitate tapping to the full the excellent training activities of the Foreign Service Institute and to create incentives for all Foreign Service personnel to take advantage of such activities.

Mr. President, we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to assure that our Foreign Service personnel have the utmost in qualifications that institutionalized training can give—especially in the field of foreign languages. In addition to their ramified duties as representa-

tives of the United States, the people of our Foreign Service are our first line of defense and the strongest offensive force which our peace-loving society can muster.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of articles relating to the subjects I have discussed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 21, 1959]

SILENT SPOKESMEN ABROAD

John B. Fisher, former administrative assistant and chief political aid to Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts, recently returned from his fourth trip to the Middle East with some forthright criticism of the U.S. Foreign Service.

A New Bedford audience heard Mr. Fisher direct particular attention to the language training of State Department representatives abroad, which he described as so elementary as to be no training at all—in our embassies abroad fewer than five or six Americans in an Embassy can speak the language of the country in which they serve.

In Belgrade, only 3 of 44 Americans can speak the Yugoslav national tongue.

In Athens, only 6 of 79 Americans in the Foreign Service can speak modern Greek dialects fluently.

In New Delhi, the United States has no personnel who can speak the several Indian dialects required for effective communication there. By contrast, the Russians have specific training courses in Moscow devoted exclusively to training diplomats for Indian service.

As Mr. Fisher concluded on the basis of this unenviable record, "In other words, our spokesmen abroad can't speak—hence, are no spokesmen at all."

This is a dangerous, if not tragic, situation in a world in which nations must know in precise detail what is going on virtually every minute. To be uninformed could mean failure to survive in the present East-West power struggle of the cold war.

If, as Mr. Fisher declared, "the State Department almost automatically rejects every proposal to improve our Foreign Service," Congress should embark upon a study of the situation, aimed at overriding and overhauling the State Department system. The program for training Foreign Service officers should be broadened and intensified.

With regard to language abilities of Americans in general, there is another approach that might be made. Dr. James Bryant Conant, president emeritus of Harvard, has been studying America's high schools for the last 2 years. Dr. Conant commented, "Almost without exception, I found a deplorable state of affairs in regard to foreign languages. Too many students with limited ability were studying a foreign language for 2 years; too few able students were studying one language long enough."

Americans must devote earnest attention to this problem, all the way from the high school class to the level of the Secretary of State. To misunderstand or to be misunderstood in the delicately balanced family of nations is riskier than ever these days.

[From the Reading (Mass.) Chronicle, Feb. 5, 1959]

OUR REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD

Our foreign policy has many angles. It is criticized by many who know very little about the actual situation in many of the countries involved. Then again, it is sometimes constructively criticized by someone with some real knowledge of foreign countries.

"A little simple honesty in our relations abroad—a little old-fashioned patriotism at home"—these words of wisdom were recently spoken by John B. Fisher, a partner in Joyce & Fisher Associates of Washington and Boston before a joint service clubs luncheon in Washington. Fisher is a former administrative assistant and chief political aid to Senator SALTONSTALL and has recently returned from his fourth trip to the Middle East in the past 12 months. He was emphatic in his criticism of the Department of State and of our Foreign Service in that part of the world.

"East is East and West is West, but the twain have met—long since," said Fisher, "a fact of which our diplomatic representatives abroad seem wholly unconscious. Our policies and practices in Greece, Turkey and Iran, for example, threaten disaster for us and for them. We seem to do even the right things in the wrong way."

"I found our Department of State disliked and distrusted throughout this area. I found our Foreign Service personnel considered fearfully ill-equipped to deal with the people and problems among which they work. And this, I know from other travelers abroad, is not an unusual situation."

"Our Foreign Service is, on the whole, inadequate to America's vital needs abroad—inadequate in its recruitment program, in the training of its personnel and in its protocol-ridden, ingrown operations in countless cities around the world."

"The Department of State almost automatically rejects every proposal to improve our Foreign Service. The dangerous implications of this are beyond description."

"The recommendation that a Foreign Service Academy be established comparable to West Point and Annapolis is dismissed for the most absurd of reasons."

"The language training of our Foreign Service personnel is so elementary as to be no training at all—in our embassies in a dozen major capitals abroad fewer than five or six Americans on embassy duty can speak the language of the country in which they serve."

"For example: In Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia, only 3 of 44 Americans on duty in that Embassy there can speak Serb-Croat, the Yugoslav national tongue; in Athens, not more than half a dozen of our 79 Americans in Foreign Service can speak modern Greek dialects fluently; in New Delhi, the capital of India, we have no personnel who can speak the several Indian dialects required for effective communication there, whereas the Russians are known to have specific training courses in Moscow for Indian service alone."

"In other words, our spokesmen abroad can't speak—hence are no spokesmen at all. This is worse than a crime; it is a political blunder of the first magnitude—and we, as American citizens, are to blame for not insisting on the very best representation abroad, in our own interest, in our own defense."

"Most important of all, perhaps, is our Government's failure to make use of our able, well-informed businessmen in these nations."

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Mar. 30, 1958]

AN AMBASSADOR NEEDS THE POWER OF SPEECH

Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, believes it is important for American officials in Foreign Service to speak the language of the country in which they are serving. He has introduced a bill to advance his idea. He would require that certain posts in certain countries be filled by Foreign Service officers who can speak the native tongue.

This might seem elementary in diplomacy, as it would in business. But Senator SALTONSTALL had apparently read a recent story by James Reston of the New York Times.

It revealed that 50 percent of our Foreign Service officers have no speaking knowledge of any foreign language. These are men and women, remember, who sought a lifetime career in diplomacy. Mr. Reston further disclosed that our Ambassador in Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, is the only one we have in a Communist country who speaks the native language; that only two American Ambassadors in the nine Arab States speak Arabic; and that even in the West, we have Ambassadors in eight NATO countries who suffer from a similar handicap.

Such language failure puts us at a severe disadvantage, by comparison with the Russians and all other leading nations. We are the only ones who do not demand language proficiency for Foreign Service. We are the ones, too, who are most likely to be thought arrogant and superior when we ignore the languages of other nations.

The Saltonstall bill may start something of a revolution in our Foreign Service. The reform is painfully overdue. Daniel Defoe determined long ago that he would venture the injury of giving a woman more tongues than one. Our Foreign Service could hardly venture less, in sending men and women out to represent us in the capitals of a troubled and sensitive world.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, June 1957]

OUR TONGUETIED FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Leon and Leila Poullada)

An editorial in the October 1956 issue of the Journal, from which the title of this article is shamelessly borrowed, pointed up the need to develop adequate language skills in the Foreign Service. While the Department has been making noteworthy progress in the matter of language and area training at the Foreign Service Institute more vigorous efforts are required if we are really to untie the tongues of our Foreign Service employees.

Language training programs can, like Gaul, be divided into three parts:

1. Programs designed to arouse the interest of Foreign Service employees and their dependents in languages: The Foreign Service Institute has done commendable work on programs of this type and they are gradually gaining momentum and popularity. No matter how well-conceived this type of program may be, however, its limitations should be recognized. Its principal values lie in the psychological effect on the foreign population of having Americans sufficiently interested in their country to try to learn their language, and the satisfaction the student feels in being able to communicate with servants, shop in the bazaar, and so forth. By its very nature, however, this type of general program cannot produce a corps of fluent language experts.

2. Programs designed to meet the need for Foreign Service officers to acquire and retain fluent command of at least one world language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Arabic, Chinese): It has been axiomatic in the diplomatic services of all countries (including until recently our own) that anyone who aspired to enter the career ranks would come equipped with command of at least one world language. It is disturbing to learn from a recent survey that 50 percent of the officers in our Foreign Service are not adequately equipped (even by their own self-appraisal) in any world language. It also revealed that language deficiencies are largely concentrated in three groups of officers; (a) a few senior officers who have allowed their language skills to lapse; (b) officers, recently integrated under the Wriston program, whose previous employment did not require foreign language proficiency; and (c) new entrants to the bottom ranks of the service who, under relaxed standards of admission, have been admitted on the under-

standing that they will make up their language deficiency within a stated period.

It is interesting to contrast briefly the deficiencies in language studies in the United States with the extensive programs reportedly being carried on in the Soviet Union. In all South Asian countries where the writers have served, the number of Soviet diplomats fluent in the local language has been impressive. A recent article in the New York Times revealed the full scope of the Soviet language effort. According to this article not only are foreign languages a compulsory part of the curriculum in the elementary and secondary schools of the U.S.S.R. but a drag-net system of scholarships brings the ablest language students into institutes of higher learning such as the National Institute of Foreign Languages, where they are subjected to a strenuous 5-year course in which one or more foreign languages constitute the core of the curriculum. It is from schools of this kind that the Soviet diplomatic service draws many of its officers and the results already observable abroad are indeed impressive.

However, the only forthright solution is for the Foreign Service to provide a combination of adequate study facilities coupled with a system of sanctions and incentives. Taking into account the heavy work-load and social duties (also work) of most officers, the penalties for failure to acquire minimum language skills will have to be considerable to arouse the necessary individual effort. On the basis of experience both in learning and teaching languages, the writers have reluctantly concluded that Draconian measures will be needed to bring all officers in the Service up to the required mark. In the writers' opinion nothing less than a time limit for passing required examinations (given on a servicewide basis) coupled with loss of promotion eligibility for failure to pass, will achieve the desired results. Some measures in this direction have already been taken by the Department in recent instructions to the field such as that requiring efficiency reports to include specific statements about the officers' efforts to improve his language ability. These measures will no doubt stimulate the more conscientious, but for the Service as a whole stiffer requirements will be needed.

So much for the stick approach. Any effective program of personnel management must also include the "carrot." In the long run, the latter will, of course, produce more lasting results. Incentives should therefore be devised for rewarding employees who achieve fluency in certain languages. The Foreign Service Institute should prepare a list which would include all the world languages plus other languages of importance to the Foreign Service in which an actual or potential shortage of fluent speakers exists. In the writers' opinion, Arabic and perhaps Chinese and Russian, should be considered world languages for this purpose—in addition to French, Spanish and German. No special incentive would be offered to Foreign Service officers for fluency in only one of these world languages, since this should be considered a basic requirement for employment. But fluency in any additional language on the list should receive special recognition.

What form should these incentives take? Two possibilities are suggested here. No doubt others can be devised. A number of European countries offer monetary "language bonuses" to their diplomatic officers. The systems vary from country to country but the British method is fairly typical. Anyone who feels qualified, applies for an examination in the language of his choice. The test is both oral and written. Different tests are given for varying levels of proficiency, additional cash bonuses being awarded for each examination successfully passed. The bonus is an increment to yearly salary

usually averaging about 100 pounds. This is a permanent increment and is not lost with promotion to a higher salary bracket.

The department might do well to investigate, if it has not already done so, the various incentive programs of other countries and devise a suitable one for our Foreign Service. Perhaps a better incentive than money would be to offer "language preference" points towards promotion. This might work as follows: A separate language dossier could be prepared on each officer, listing the languages on which he has successfully passed examinations and for which he is entitled to receive a certain number of promotion points. After selection boards have rated all eligible candidates on a competitive basis without reference to language ability, the language dossiers would be handed to the boards and additional points would be awarded to those officers entitled to language credit. Thus, of two officers originally rated at the same level, the one with superior language qualifications would earn preference for promotion. This would indeed be a powerful incentive and stimulus to serious language study. It would also spur officers to gain ever higher language proficiency since this would progressively enhance promotion opportunities throughout their entire career. A similar system could be worked out for the staff corps. Administrative details would admittedly present some difficulties but if the need for developing language skills is as great as everyone seems to agree it is, the obstacle could be overcome.

3. The Foreign Service also faces a critical shortage of language and area experts, particularly in the so-called exotic areas which have in recent times become increasingly important to the foreign relations of the United States. To improve the quantity and quality of language and area training will require a greater effort than has thus far been made.

To be really effective a language and area specialist should acquire a deep understanding of the history, art, religion, social structure, and economy of the region. He must also have a good command of the language. Unless he can converse with government officials, businessmen, merchants and leaders of religious and minority groups, and can at least read the local press in the vernacular, his specialized training will not pay full dividends. Measured by these standards, language and area specialization programs, in south Asia, at least, have in the past been inadequate though we understand that greater emphasis is now being given to reading especially during the latter stages of specialist training.

The problems involved in establishing an effective corps of language and area specialists are many and complex. To surmount them will, in the writers' opinion, require improved training programs. The following minimum considerations are suggested: (a) recognition of the special difficulties involved in the study of the so-called exotic languages; (b) improvement of initial and follow-through training programs; (c) improvement of teaching methods; (d) provision of special incentives.

It is a fact that most of the exotic languages in which the Foreign Service is deficient are languages which are not easily learned by Westerners in general or Americans in particular. The structure, syntax, and the cultural concepts embedded in these languages are quite unfamiliar to the American student. Often the student is faced with a bewildering multiplicity of local language variants and dialects. South Asia, alone, according to some linguists, offers 17 major language groups and several hundred variants. To be really effective in this area a south Asia language officer should know well at least three basic languages: Hindustani (which is really two languages, Urdu and Hindi, with a common spoken vocabulary of perhaps 40 percent, but different roots and scripts), Bengali; and at least one south

Indian language, probably Tamil (a Dravidian language of different ancestry from Hindustani and Bengali which are Indo-European). In addition to these three major languages, he would also find at least a basic knowledge of Persian essential in Afghanistan and important in Pakistan as well as in Muslim areas of India.

In addition to multiple languages, the area specialist is often confronted with different levels of speech within the same language. These exist in nearly all languages but rarely in so exaggerated a form as in the exotic ones. Within one language, different vocabularies and forms are often matters of rigid social prescription and wide variances are found in classical as against contemporary literature with still different forms used for official occasions, everyday polite speech and colloquial conversation. It is difficult to find equivalent examples in any Western language unless we hark back to Roman times and compare the classical Latin of Horace with the contemporary Vulgate and the still more common idiom of the plebeian masses. The language and area specialist must somehow command the major languages of his region and sort out the various speech levels for the proper social occasions and groups.

Recognition of these special problems points the way to the improvements which should be made in language and area training. Perhaps the first and most important step is to gain acceptance for the concept that once an officer is selected for language and area specialization he becomes part of a marked group whose needs and problems necessarily differ from those of other officers. Routine administrative and personnel practices cannot meet these peculiar requirements. Special consideration will have to be given to this group with the Foreign Service Institute playing a more prominent and controlling role in such matters as assignments, tours of duty, advanced training details, etc.

Until recently, initial training for most language and area specialists consisted of a year's study at a university. Both area and language studies had to be compressed into this relatively short time. After the study tour, the specialist was largely on his own. He often had to scramble by his own efforts for an assignment where his training could be put to use. In some cases lack of vacancies and shortage of personnel resulted in assignments to posts where his newly acquired language was not generally spoken. In many cases what had been learned became rusty from disuse and ground was lost instead of gained.

Then again there appeared to be no attempt at career planning for the language and area specialist as such. There was, and still seems to be, no planned program of assignments aimed at safeguarding and developing the Government's initial investment in the specialized training. Assignments to future posts depended, and still do, on the vagaries of existing vacancies, position classifications, coincidence of home leave and transfer schedules of officer replacements and all the usual paraphernalia of personnel redtape. Recently there have been signs of improvement. The initial training period has been lengthened and is usually preceded by intensive language training at the Foreign Service Institute. Language schools, such as the one for Arabic in Beirut, have been set up in a country where the language is spoken to give the student practical experience along with academic training. A number of other improvements have been instituted or are on the way. But much more is needed.

In the writers' opinion, an adequate training program for a language and area specialist (particularly for south Asia) would consist of a period of initial training and a period of followthrough training. The initial training would include:

1. Three months' full-time intensive language training at the Foreign Service Institute.
2. One full year of academic language and area studies at a university.
3. Eighteen months of travel, residence, and study in the area, nine months of which could be at a university with a specific research assignment to fulfill.
4. Assignment to a post in the area where the language is widely spoken.

This initial training period should be followed by a 10-year planned program of assignments which would constitute the followthrough training. This career-planning phase should be started as soon as the officer is selected for training. Before he finishes his university assignment both the Department and he should know in a rather definite way what his assignments for the next 10 years will be. The objective of this plan would be to insure that this period of followup training will develop the language and area skill acquired during the initial training period. The career planning office recently established in the Department could make an excellent start by giving priority to planning the careers of language and area specialists in whom the Government already has a very substantial investment which should not be dissipated by haphazard assignments. To insure that future slots exist at the right time and place for language and area officers, would it not be possible to establish one or more unclassified positions at appropriate posts and in the Department? This would permit assignments in accordance with career-planning needs rather than as dictated by the fortuitous existence of vacancies in the right grades at the right times. At present it is only rarely and by bare chance that the right officer and the right vacancy coincide. Only by creating extra positions not subject to rigid personnel classification can this difficulty be overcome. The actual duties of an officer occupying one of these positions would depend on his rank and special abilities. To establish such positions will require understanding and cooperation from the personnel and budget offices in the Department and perhaps special congressional action, but this or some similar plan is an indispensable step.

Another problem which requires more study than can be given to it in this article is the question of language teaching methods. This is a murky and somewhat controversial field in which one risks drawing down the wrath of the linguistic scientists who have strongly influenced language teaching since the last war. Not being linguistic scientists, the writers are not qualified to enter into the merits of this controversy from a scientific viewpoint. Our comments are simply based on actual field experience in learning and teaching languages and we are interested in the practical question: What actually produces the best results from the standpoint of the student? These observations have led us to conclude that the new teaching techniques have much to commend them and are especially effective for students who want a quick useful but not necessarily accurate, command of a language. They are therefore better suited for general language programs than for training language and area specialists whose needs are of a different order.

The new systems of language teaching have discarded traditional methods in favor of shortcut or direct teaching courses in which the primary emphasis is on the spoken language. These lessons are often written in transliterative systems which employs so many diacritical marks to represent the strange sounds of the exotic language that in many cases it is just as easy to learn the foreign script as to learn the romanized transliteration.

Language schools for missionaries in South Asia with many years of experience in language teaching have long ago concluded that

for students who careers are to be in the area, it is just as easy and ultimately far more fruitful, to teach the local scripts from the beginning. Their language tests are therefore written in the native alphabets. Progress at first may be slower but in the long run the ability to read fluently gives the student a deeper and broader knowledge of the language. This principle is perhaps even more applicable to the language and area specialist whose language needs are of the same long-range nature but even more demanding than those of the missionary.

A similar argument can be made for the study of grammar. It is sometimes overlooked that grammar itself is a short-cut to language. It can be learned empirically or inductively from numerous examples, but for many adult students it is much quicker to learn the rule which is the essence of the many instances and then apply it to individual cases, rather than the other way around. A great deal depends, too, on the propensities of each student. It is the writers' feeling that these differences in susceptibility to various teaching methods have not been sufficiently recognized. Just as educational psychologists now recognize that some students are eye-minded and some ear-minded, experience in teaching languages shows that some students learn more readily by methods which side-step grammar and rely heavily on direct spoken exercises whereas others can advance further and more quickly by learning the basic rules of the language and applying them to individual speech situations.

As the reader may have guessed, this is a plea that the teaching methods now in general use for the training of language and area specialists, be carefully reviewed. Not all traditional ways of learning a language are necessarily bad, any more than all the new methods are necessarily good. Perhaps the solution lies in a reasonable synthesis of the two systems which, after testing in the crucible of experience rather than in speech laboratories, would incorporate the best aspects of both.

Lastly, the problem of providing adequate incentives to language and area specialists must be tackled. Judging from appeals which have been periodically circulated to the field, the Department encounters considerable difficulty in attracting sufficient numbers of candidates for language and area training. This has been especially true for those regions of the world, such as the Middle East and south Asia, where needs for specialists are growing. The reasons for the reluctance of Foreign Service officers to volunteer for this training are clear. To the candidate for language and area training, many disadvantages and few advantages are visible. If he applies for this training he must take 1 or 2 years out of his regular career while his colleagues in substantive assignments presumably enhance their chances for promotion. After his training he and his family have to look forward to a lifetime of service in a series of hardship posts with only occasional relief by assignment to Washington, which to many in the Service, is just another hardship post. In spite of references in the precepts to selection boards there has been little in the performances of past boards to indicate that the language and area specialist serving in Madras, Jidda, or Vientiane is viewed with any particular preference for promotion over his nonspecialist colleagues in Madrid, Buenos Aires, or Sydney. Furthermore, he may discover that prolonged service in one area will adversely affect his finances. He will find that his household appliances, clothing, and car wear out much faster than they would in nonhardship areas and that cost-of-living allowances will seldom cover these added expenses. Not only must he re-equip himself and his family more frequently but he will find this process is more expensive than for his nonspecialist colleague.

An illustration will make this clear: Officer X, an area specialist, and officer Y, a nonspecialist, serving at Lahore are transferred. Following normal Foreign Service practice they order from the United States a car and other items needed to equip themselves at their next post. As an area specialist, X is transferred within his area to Bombay. As a nonarea specialist, Y is available for worldwide assignment and is transferred, let us say, to Rome. X at once finds that he must buy many items for Bombay which Y does not need to purchase for Rome. But even worse, in accordance with Foreign Service Regulations, X must pay the difference between what it would have cost to ship his purchases Lahore-Bombay and the actual shipping cost New York-Bombay.

All these considerations add up to rather powerful deterrents, even for those whose natural interests attract them to these uncomfortable areas of the world. The language and area specialist thus finds himself a member of a select group but one that is singled out for penalty more often than for privilege. This, of course, has its psychological advantages in creating a certain élan and esprit de corps among the specialist group. The Marine Corps and the Foreign Legion have found it advantageous to elevate this masochism (latent to some extent in all men) to heights of heroism. But although this may have some appeal to the language and area candidate, the task of building a solid and effective corps of specialists will require powerful and positive incentives.

These incentives should be both psychological and material. The former category could include some of the reforms suggested in this article such as effective initial training and a planned follow through series of assignments. The language and area officer should be given the feeling, supported by tangible evidence, that he belongs to a specially selected group over which the Department, and particularly the F.S.I., maintain a vigilant eye.

In the category of material incentives, the logical first step should be to remove or minimize some of the obvious inequities which now accompany the mere fact of being a language and area specialist. In addition to correcting obviously discriminatory procedures, positive incentive, either in the form of pay increments or through some system of promotion preference similar to that suggested for general language programs in the first part of this article, should be instituted. In this case too, separate dossiers could be prepared on language and area specialists which would be handed to selection boards only after all eligible officers have been rated, so that as between two officers of equal ability, the language and area specialist would receive promotion preference. Incidentally, a specialist officer who was extraordinarily gifted in language might thus earn a double promotion credit, one for his language and area specialization and one along with other officers who had successfully passed examinations in language listed for promotion credit. The languages of his area of specialty would, of course, not earn him credit in the general language incentive program.

To sum up, the problem which faces the Foreign Service in its attempt to untie the tongues of its employees is a complex and difficult one. Different types of programs will be needed for the different groups that have to be reached: one for employees interested only in acquiring a useful knowledge of the local language; another for all officers who need to have a command of at least one world language; and again another for the particular needs of language and area specialists. The key to the solution of these problems lies in the formulation and institution of adequate training programs

and of incentive systems tailored to the results which the Department hopes to achieve.

[From the Foreign Service Journal,
February 1959]

FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINK IN AMERICA'S ARMOR?

(By Jacob Ornstein)

"The United States is probably weaker in foreign language abilities than any major country in the world," declared Marion Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before a Senate committee in January 1958. He added, "If we are to gain and hold the confidence and good will of peoples around the world, we must be able to talk to them not in our language but in theirs." In recent months a growing number of statements of this kind by public leaders has caused thinking Americans to become more than a little concerned about the shocking state of our foreign language preparation.

In the pre-sputnik days warnings about the poor state of our linguistic preparedness were greeted by yawns, or at best, mild interest. The Soviet satellites circling about the earth brought us face to face with some very disquieting facts. One of the most upsetting of these has been the news that of the 1,400 or so Soviet technical journals received by our libraries, less than 50 have until now been regularly translated.

Does it matter? In 1951 an article on contact relay networks appeared in the Journal of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. So few of our scientists, read Russian that it was not noticed until 1955. In the opinion of Dr. William Locke of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, this oversight cost us at least \$200,000 in duplicated research, not to mention the time-lag.

A survey by the author published last year by the State Department's External Research Staff revealed that of our 1,800 or so colleges less than 180 were teaching Russian—to about 5,000 students. By contrast, in the U.S.S.R. an estimated 10 million Russians of all ages are busy mastering English.

World War II left the United States in a position of leadership for which we were ill-prepared linguistically. Decades of neglect had brought language training to its lowest level in our history. When Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 about 20 colleges were teaching Russian, while an insignificant number offered the languages of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other strategic areas. The Armed Forces and the Government scrambled to set up emergency teaching programs where weary-eyed GI's raced against time to get a smattering of Japanese, Norwegian, Bulgarian, and some 40 other tongues urgently needed to conduct the war on our farflung battlefronts.

The postwar period brought an aggravation of the language problem. The tasks of occupation and of dealing with new states created an unprecedented demand for linguistic know-how. Since the end of the war at least 15 sovereign states have been born, many employing languages not offered by any American school. India alone has at least 100 dialects and 14 official tongues. Of these, Hindi, spoken by about 150 million persons, is taught by a mere half dozen American universities.

Those whose stock answer to this problem is "Let 'em learn English" are simply blind to the international facts of life. The dangers of linguistic ignorance are dramatically shown by a story which has become well-known in Foreign Service circles. When the American Embassy was set up in a certain new Far Eastern State, we had not a single officer with competence in the language and had to hire local interpreters. Wishing to please their employers, they translated everything to sound very flattering to the United States.

When we were able to train and send out our own linguists, we were horrified to find that anti-American sentiment was raging fiercely in that country.

Secretary of State Dulles, in requesting additional funds for language training at the 85th Congress last year, pointed out that less than half of our Foreign Service officers had a practical speaking and reading knowledge of French, German, or Spanish, while barely 25 percent of the incoming trainees had a working knowledge of these tongues. For this reason, he observed, the State Department had been obliged to relax severely its language requirement in recruiting new officers. Perhaps the most telling commentary on these figures has been provided by Secretary Dulles himself when he asserted that "the effectiveness of our efforts to create a stable pattern of international relations hinges to an important degree on the establishment of understanding between peoples. Language can both aid and obstruct this vital understanding."

While American high school students have been enrolled in driver education, basket-weaving, and telephone techniques, the Soviets have left no stone unturned to provide their citizens with the ordnance of foreign language. Writing in the New York Times, Mr. Theodore Shabad a few months ago described the ambitious network of schools being established throughout the Soviet Union where at the tender age of 8 bright youngsters are launched on all-out programs of language mastery. In Moscow there are three schools where youngsters are getting their three R's exclusively in French, German, or English. In Leningrad two elementary boarding schools put the children through their paces in Chinese and Hindi. Special schools have been established in the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan to introduce youngsters to Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, and other languages.

In vivid contrast to the intense Soviet language drive, the linguistic picture in the United States is a depressing one. According to Modern Language Association figures, of the 24 major languages of the world, each spoken by more than 20 million persons, only Spanish and French are studied by an appreciable number of Americans. It is hardly any wonder, therefore, that of our representatives abroad perhaps 1 out of 40 can speak effectively any language but English.

That this problem reared its ugly head as early as the Colonial Period is revealed by John Adams in a letter addressed to the Treasury Board. In it he commented:

"I found myself in France ill-versed in the language, the laws, customs, and manners of the country, and had the mortification to find my colleagues little better informed than myself, vain as this may seem."

Referring to Benjamin Franklin, he noted that the latter "spoke the language imperfectly and was able to write bad French."

However, the language needs of those early diplomats appear trifling compared with those of today. At a conference in linguistic needs in government, held by the U.S. Office of Education in March, 1957, it was learned that a total of 106 foreign tongues are required for our government agencies and armed services. As our schools have simply not been producing enough qualified linguists, the services and many government agencies have been obliged to create special schools. At the Army Language School, for example, intensive training, lasting from 6 to 15 months, is provided in 29 languages, ranging from French to Vietnamese.

Despite the acute need for Americans who can speak languages, few students enrolled in college language courses go far enough in their study to be able to carry on a simple conversation or read a newspaper editorial; worse yet, too few colleges provide courses which give insight into the background of

areas other than Western Europe. The Conference on Asian Affairs recently reported that fully forty percent of our colleges have no courses on the Far East where over half the world's population resides.

Condemning the short-sightedness of many of our universities, Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, last year stated, "We must make an effort to know more of the life and thought of the great Asian leaders who have had such profound influence on the lives of hundreds of millions of men and women. It will be a long time," he added, "before Asoka and Akbar and the Gupta Kings are commonplace terms along with Julius Caesar, Henry IV of France, and the Tudor Kings of England."

The Modern Language Association of America, in a four-year study supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, has revealed facts and figures on language in our schools which give little reason for complacency. Surveying 971 American colleges and universities, the Association found that more than half of these schools offer no language other than French, Spanish, or German. It concluded that three-quarters of the world's population speaks languages not taught in American universities.

While the Soviets are busy courting the uncommitted neutrals through a never-ending series of cultural, scientific missions, dance groups and sports teams—all well supplied with linguists—we have the doubtful distinction of sending more tongue-tied persons abroad than any other modern country. Unhappily, this is not limited to the average citizen who invests in a summer cruise, but applies to our intellectual and school leaders as well. Commenting on this, the distinguished teacher and writer, Henri Peyre, of Yale University, has written: "Americans have taken refuge in the easy but paralyzing prejudice—totally groundless, in fact—that they are not gifted for languages. . . . They have been afflicted by shyness when confronted by the need to master another tongue and have cultivated inhibitions which a little courage would soon dispel. American scientists, scholars, and diplomats have thus done incalculable damage to the prestige of their country abroad, through their placid assumption that everyone should understand English."

Is there any way out of the language muddle? Indeed, the situation has become so critical that Government leaders have decided to take action. Public Law 85-864, passed by the 85th Congress, authorizes \$887 million for a 4-year program of development in science, mathematics, and languages.

The plan proposes some daring innovations. It calls for a system of language institutes to be established at colleges for the purpose of providing language teachers and supervisors with training intended to improve the quality and effectiveness of instruction. In addition, the proposal provides for the development of foreign-language training and service centers at selected institutions to furnish instruction in rare but strategic tongues rarely or never taught in the United States.

This is certainly a step in the right direction. However, despite the merit of such a plan, it is still an emergency measure which does not attack the problem at the very core. The solution to our linguistic dilemma can come only through a thorough overhauling of our language teaching system.

First of all, it is necessary to streamline our teaching methods. Most of the Nation's 25,000 language instructors are capable and devoted individuals. Unfortunately, there are still a considerable number who teach a language by the well-known expedient of keeping one page ahead of the class. Elsewhere, well qualified teachers find themselves hamstrung by a rigid program of study stressing grammatical analysis and transla-

tion of literary classics. This has resulted in drab, uninteresting instruction which has caused many generations of Americans to abhor language study, recalled by them as a tortured exercise in the memorization of irregular verbs and adjectives.

Part and parcel of the improvement of teaching methods is the need for increased use of audiovisual aids and laboratories. Although no panacea for language problems, the use of magnetic tape recorders and other equipment in soundproof laboratories has proved to be a boon to the teaching of foreign languages, especially for the speaking and understanding phases.

A sweeping change must be made with regard to the age at which young Americans are introduced to foreign languages. In no other civilized country is the mistake made of presenting a second language to the individual so late in his school career. The findings of physiological, psychological, and linguistic researchers indicate clearly that by the age of 5 a child has mastered his own tongue and is ready to learn one or several foreign tongues.

Fortunately, America is witnessing the development of a vigorous trend—the movement to introduce foreign languages in the elementary schools, known as FLES by educators. Sparked by Earl J. McGrath while he was U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1952, the movement has had a meteoric career. In 5 years, the number of grade-school youngsters has risen from insignificant numbers to some 300,000 junior linguists enrolled in French, Spanish, German, Italian, and other languages. Even so, at the present time, less than one youngster out of a hundred can get started in a foreign language at a time when he can learn it perfectly and effortlessly.

In the modern program of language instruction which America so badly needs today, the youngster would begin the study of a foreign language by the third grade and continue it through high school and into college, until he has a good speaking, writing, and reading knowledge. Let it be remembered that a Soviet youngster who wishes to attend college must present at least 6 years of a modern language and that he must usually continue it there for several years more.

In addition to increasing the number of years that a foreign language is studied, it is essential that we expand greatly the range of languages taught in our schools. Most high schools and colleges are still offering the same languages which they taught 30 years ago. There is an urgent need to introduce important world languages like Russian, Polish, Czech, Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian, Arabic, Swahili, and others.

Moreover, the language profession needs to be made much more attractive. Dr. H. B. Wells, president of Indiana University, has called attention to the declining number of students going into the linguistic field. "Last year," he noted in 1957, "of the entire graduating class a mere 1.6 percent was specializing in languages, a mere drop in the bucket compared to our needs." It is, however, little wonder that present day youth is giving this field a cold shoulder, when incentives are so poor. The training of a language teacher or translator requires from 7 to 10 years. Consequently, many youngsters prefer to go into fields where the training is less rigorous and rewards are greater.

In the final analysis, there can be no lasting solution to the language problem until the general public is made aware of the linguistic problem and demands from its schools the type of language training suited for a jet-propelled world where borders are constantly shrinking.

A start has been made in acquainting Americans at the grass roots with language problems. The U.S. Commission for UNESCO,

in cooperation with the Modern Language Association, has, during the past few years held several hundred "citizen consultation" meetings intended to acquaint laymen and leaders in typical American communities with the facts and figures on our language snarl. Electrified into action, many individuals and civic groups have acted through their school boards and administrators to improve language facilities at the local level.

Americans are beginning to wake up to our dangerous language lag—a weak chink in the Nation's armor. As a leader in the free world, the United States cannot afford to continue to be tongue-tied in the world arena. Language—the verbal stuff of international communication—deserves a new deal in the American classroom.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1958]
FOREIGN-SERVICE WOES: A COMMENT ON INABILITY OF U.S. ENVOYS TO TALK LANGUAGE OF NATIONS THEY'RE IN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Sometimes a small incident tells more about the problems of U.S. foreign policy than a month's debate in the Senate. President Eisenhower's luncheon yesterday with the Advisory Committee of the Foreign Service Institute is a case in point. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the sad state of language training in the Foreign Service, which is primarily responsible for the administration of U.S. foreign policy at home and overseas.

Actually, what it turned out to be was a briefing session, primarily by men outside the Government, for the President on just how poorly trained in languages his staff is.

The facts are as follows:

Fifty percent of the entire Foreign Service officer corps do not have a speaking knowledge of any foreign language.

Seventy percent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service are in the same state.

Llewellyn E. Thompson, U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, is the only U.S. Ambassador in a Communist country who speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned.

In the nine Arabic-speaking countries, the only U.S. Ambassadors who speak Arabic are Raymond Hare in Egypt and Parker T. Hart in Jordan.

In the non-English-speaking countries of the North Atlantic Treaty nations, the U.S. Ambassadors do not have a workable knowledge of the language in Belgium, France, Germany, Iceland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece.

Vinton Chapin, the Ambassador in Luxembourg, is fluent in French; Val Peterson, in Copenhagen, claims a fair knowledge of Danish; Frances E. Willis, in Oslo, says she can speak fair Norwegian, and James D. Zellerbach, in Rome, says merely that he is studying Italian.

The same state of affairs, or worse, exists in the U.S. embassies of Asia, and naturally enough, the President was not only interested but enthusiastic about doing something about it.

Those at the White House luncheon were Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, of the Red Cross; Robert Calkins, of the Brookings Institution; Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs; Dr. Clyde K. Kluckhohn of the Peabody Museum; Charles E. Saltzman, former Assistant Secretary of State; and Henry M. Wriston, former president of Brown University.

Also, for the administration, Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter; Deputy Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson; Gen. Robert Cutler, an assistant to the President; Harold B. Hoskins, director of the Foreign Service Institute; and the newly appointed Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans.

It is the function of the Foreign Service Institute to provide language training for Foreign Service officers, but its funds have repeatedly been cut, with little or no effort by the President to do anything about it.

Though he is responsible for the appointment of ambassadors, and though the Foreign Service officers who head our embassies overseas are his personal representatives, the President's attitude was reported to be: "Why didn't somebody tell me about this?"

He was sincerely disturbed, and even angry, about the difficulty in getting adequate funds to provide the necessary language training. He observed that a former secretary of his was recently given a 4-year training course at a university on Air Force funds, and he wondered why it was not possible to get even a few months' training for the men who were involved in one of the most lively periods of diplomatic activity in recent years.

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY INVOLVED

His visitors told him in plain and simple terms. The reason, as almost everybody familiar with the State Department's problems knows, is Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of the 14th District of New York (Kings County).

Mr. ROONEY is chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that presides over the State Department budget. He has been slashing that budget for years, is less than enthusiastic about giving ambassadors the necessary language training or representation allowances, and is generally regarded, despite his obscurity, as one of the most powerful men in America, in a negative way, so far as U.S. foreign policy is concerned.

The President was interested in Mr. ROONEY and offered to do something about talking to him. He could not have been more sympathetic to the problems placed before him and his visitors came away convinced that they had had a most useful luncheon.

But at least some of them wondered why the language and training problem had not been discussed and dealt with at the highest level of the Government more than 5 years ago, or at least in 1956, when the embassies were filled with presidential appointees who could not speak the language of the countries to which they were assigned.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1959]

WHERE AMERICA IS LAST

Recently when some Americans were visiting a school in Moscow a Russian girl of high school age arose and addressed the visitors in English.

It was rather broken English, but it was intelligible. And one of the American visitors, Jenkins Lloyd Jones of the Tulsa Tribune, confessed to sadness that there was not a public school in the United States where a single pupil could welcome Russian visitors in the Russian language.

While English is taught in most of the leading schools of Russia the Russian language is taught in few public schools in the United States.

A few weeks ago a convoy of three Russian airplanes landed at the capital city of one of the countries of the southwestern Pacific. Every one of the 125 visiting Russians was able to speak the native language. They had been trained in that language before they undertook their mission. But in the American Embassy in that island capital there was only one employee who could speak the native language, and he was a native of the island, an interpreter employed by the United States.

It is unusual for an American Ambassador to be able to speak the language of the country to which he is assigned. This ignorance of foreign languages has its

handicaps. To begin with it is a positive embarrassment, because an ability to speak many languages is considered the hallmark of an educated person in most of the world's capitals.

Hence no matter how skilled the American representative may be in the language of his own country he is written down as ignorant when he shows his inability to speak another tongue.

It has been argued for years that no one should be sent abroad to represent the United States officially unless he is able to speak the language of the country to which he is assigned. But nothing important has ever resulted from the argument. Primarily the United States is simply unable to find competent diplomats who are acquainted with foreign languages. So we continue to send into the capitals and cultural centers of the world men who are unable to understand one word of the language they hear in councils or on the streets.

Nothing corrective is likely to be done about this for a long time. You can imagine what would happen to the American lawmaker who launched a movement to require the teaching of the Russian language in all American schools. Yet Russian speech is gradually becoming the court language of half the world (Daily Oklahoman.)

IMPORTANCE OF THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, sometimes we are prone to forget and to neglect a word of tribute or praise to an industry—and to the men who are engaged in it—which plays so important a role in the lives of every one of us and which is so essentially a fundamental part of our progress and development as a Nation. We are fortunate in the great and diversified types of our American industry. Our past development has been possible because of the progress these industries have made through their growth and expansion. We owe them much for that.

Our future progress may well depend upon the preservation and continued healthy existence of these vital industries. Too many of our citizens have their private funds invested in them for that investment to be neglected. Too many workers depend upon their continued employment in all our industries for us to allow any one to be the object of discriminatory practices or policies.

In my opinion, one of the most vital of our industries today is our railroads. To neglect this segment of our economic system would indeed have dire and far-reaching consequences. Thousands of workers depend upon our great railway system for their employment—trackworkers, repairmen, engineers, brakemen, conductors, station agents, office workers, and executives. So we must not overlook any of them when such a vital industry requires our thoughtful consideration for its future well-being.

I have prepared a brief statement relative to this great industry, and I desire to have my statement incorporated in the RECORD. Later, I shall expand my remarks, for this vital and ingenious American enterprise deserves our most careful consideration.

TRIBUTE TO A VITAL INDUSTRY

For the past few years, I have become increasingly concerned about the physi-

cal and financial condition of our great American railroad industry. I followed with much interest the hearings which were held last winter under the able leadership of our colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I was much encouraged, of course, when the Congress, in August, enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and removed the onerous 3 percent excise tax on freight shipments.

These two pieces of legislation were, of course, very helpful, and, in my opinion, constituted a good beginning. We must, however, continue to look for a complete solution to the still present problems of discriminatory regulation, subsidization, and excessive taxation—all of which still plague this great industry. The ultimate solution of these problems can be accomplished only when the Congress acts to take into account the railroads' essentiality and importance to the economy of this country.

More than \$35 billion of private capital has been invested in an immense railroad plant of shops, signals, communications, and rolling stock. More than 2 million freight and passenger cars weave in and out across the 220,000-mile network of rails, and carry almost half of the Nation's intercity freight traffic and nearly one-third of its commercial passenger load.

The accomplishments of the railroads are staggering. In just a 60-minute period, more than 1,000 freight and passenger trains start on scheduled runs all over the Nation, and the same number pull into terminals. More than 3½ million tons of goods will move some 20 miles during the same hour. On the passenger side, trains will perform transportation equivalent to carrying 3 million people 1 mile. Yet, even in the light of these facts, some persons think that the railroads are dying.

Let me say a word about the human side of railroading. At the end of 1956, more than 1 million persons were regularly employed in our railroad industry. Today, because of the problems which are still hanging around the necks of the railroads, and because of the recession, railroad employment has dropped to about 825,000 people, who receive about \$5 billion a year in wages. Another half-million people work for companies which are directly dependent upon the \$3 billion the railroad industry spends in an average year for materials, supplies, new plants, and equipment. Still more people—a million, in fact—have invested their savings in railroad stocks and bonds.

What about the financial support the railroads give to local and State governments and to the Federal Government? More than \$1 billion is paid by the industry in a normal year in the form of taxes which help the States build and maintain our schools and other important projects. All of this makes America a better place in which to live. Some of the railroads' tax money even finds its way into the construction of highways, waterways, airways, and airports. This is a remarkable benefit to competing carriers.

So this is a vital industry which reaches into Hometown, U.S.A. Hun-